

REMARKS

This Response, submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated April 21, 2006, is believed to be fully responsive to the points of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-22, 28 and 30 are pending. Claims 15-20 and 30 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over published US Patent Application No. 2003/0193987 (Zalameda), in view of published US patent Application No. 20020180384/US Patent No. 6,583,588 (Erhardt). Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Zalameda, in view of US Patent No. 6,759,793 (Narita). Claims 21, 22 and 28 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Zalameda, in view of Erhardt, in further view of Integrated Gate-Commutated Thyristors (Caroll). Applicants respectfully submit the following remarks in support of the patentability of the claims.

1. Claims 15-20 and 30:

Claims 15-20 and 30 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Zalameda, in view of Erhardt. Applicants maintain the position that Claims 15-20 and 30 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art, for the reasons articulated in Applicants' Amendment dated August 4, 2005. However, to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants submit herewith an Affidavit under 37 CFR 1.131 and supporting Exhibits A, B and C establishing that Applicants conceived the present invention prior to October 11, 2001 and actually reduced to practice the present invention on October 11, 2001.

Zalameda was filed April 10, 2002 and was published October 16, 2003. Accordingly, Zalameda could only possibly qualify as prior art under 35 USC 102(e). In view of the fact that Applicants conceived and reduced their invention to practice prior to the April 10, 2002 filing date of Zalameda, Applicants respectfully submit that Zalameda does not satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 102 and thus is not prior art for the present invention.

The Examiner cites Erhardt to supply the active quenching means recitation. As regards the other recitations of Claim 15, the Examiner has not suggested that Erhardt supplies these recitations.

For the reasons presented in Applicants' Amendment dated August 4, 2005, Applicants maintain their position that Erhardt does not teach or suggest at least one

active quenching means configured to quench at least one lamp to control a duration of a flash, wherein the active quenching means is configured to receive a control signal T2 and to quench the lamp in response to the control signal T2, as recited by Claim 15.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 15-20 and 30 are patentably distinguishable over Erhardt. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 15-20 and 30 under 35 USC 103(a) over Zalameda, in view of Erhardt be withdrawn.

2. Claim 15:

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Zalameda, in view of Narita. As noted above in Section 1, Zalameda does not qualify as prior art under any provision of 35 USC 102.

Narita is directed to a lamp unit for a projector and does not teach or suggest at least one active quenching means configured to quench at least one flash lamp to control a duration of a flash, as recited by Claim 15. Instead, the Examiner has pointed to a cooling means 50 and a means 60 for changing the power of a mercury lamp. As regards the other recitations of Claim 15, the Examiner has not suggested that Narita supplies these recitations.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over Narita and request that the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 USC 103(a) over Zalameda, in view of Narita be withdrawn.

3. Claims 21, 22 and 28:

Claims 21, 22 and 28 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Zalameda, in view of Erhardt, in further view of Integrated Gate-Commutated Thyristors (Caroll).

Claims 21, 22 and 28 depend from Claim 15. As discussed above in Section 1, Zalameda does not qualify as prior art under any provision of 35 USC 102, and Claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over Erhardt. The Examiner has cited Caroll for teachings regarding power semiconductor switches. However, Caroll does not supply the above-discussed deficiencies of Erhardt.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 21, 22 and 28 are patentably distinguishable over the Erhardt and Caroll, either alone or in combination,

and respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 21, 22 and 28 under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn.


In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 15-22, 28 and 30 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Please charge all applicable fees associated with the submittal of this Amendment and any other fees applicable to this application to the Assignee's Deposit Account No. 07-0868.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,



Penny A. Clarke
Reg. No. 46, 627

General Electric Company
Building K1, Room 3A72
Niskayuna, New York 12309
Jul 19, 2006
Telephone: (518) 387-5349